

I would note that the average school in the United States costs nearly \$6 million to build. This bill's funding for school construction of \$7 million would only allow us to build the equivalent of one school each year.

Mr. Chairman, there is need for more than one school a year in my district alone. Section 8007 must be increased substantially if we are to effectively educate our children on Federal lands in a safe and healthy environment. Indeed, when Congress reauthorized the Impact Aid law in 1994 and created section 8007, it envisioned this part of the Impact Aid Program to be funded at a minimum of \$25 million each year.

Section 8007 has only been appropriated to \$5 million in each of the last few years, and the money has yet to be distributed to any school districts. Not only that, but a study by the National Association of Federally Impacted Schools, or NAFIS, recently concluded that \$25 million is the amount needed to help address the construction needs of federally impacted school districts. So full funding of section 8007 would compensate for the inability of heavily impacted districts to raise construction funds on their own.

□ 1615

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us compare the situation of these federally impacted schoolchildren with the bureaucracy of the NLRB from which we propose to offset the funding increase for school construction.

As I said before, Mr. Chairman, on the Navajo reservation in my district, school buildings are literally falling down around students. I am sure that many of my colleagues from other federally impacted districts could make similar claims.

The NLRB, on the other hand, occupies a posh building in one of the most prestigious parts of Washington, DC, at a cost of \$21 million a year. Children on the reservation are often underfed and malnourished.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HAYWORTH was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, children on the reservation are often underfed and malnourished and lack the proper books and supplies. But at the NLRB, all five Board members have their own showers, kitchens, libraries, and are provided with clean linen weekly.

And get this, Mr. Chairman, while the schools on our military bases and reservations struggle to attract and retain qualified teachers, each Board member of the NLRB has 18 to 22 lawyers on his staff, while the NLRB general counsel employs 628 lawyers at an average salary of more than \$76,000 a year.

Mr. Chairman, in almost every survey I have seen, the American people list education as their top priority. We

have a chance to do something to improve education today in a very helpful way by increasing funding for the construction of schools on some of our Federal lands to serve some of the poorest children in America.

By contrast, Mr. Chairman, I have not seen one survey citing clean linen for high-priced lawyers as a pressing national problem. In short, Mr. Chairman, is there anyone in this Chamber who really believes that the NLRB needs the \$18 million more than the children on our reservations and military bases? Because, Mr. Chairman, that is the simple choice before us today.

I do not want to make it sound as if this Congress has not tried to tighten the reins on the NLRB. On the contrary, I am pleased that the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education has frozen funding for the NLRB over the past few years. Nevertheless, the NLRB can and should get by on less. This proposal is not a drastic cut. It is merely a way for us to set our priorities for our scarce Federal dollars in a more human way.

Mr. Chairman, we are confronted with a stark but simple choice: lawyers or children, bureaucrats or schools. Mr. Chairman, again I would say this amendment is a straightforward choice: Lawyers or children, bureaucracy or schools. I implore the Members to support this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RIGGS) assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, my good friend and colleague from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] said that he has the most heavily impacted congressional district in America. I have, perhaps, one of the most heavily impacted school districts in America with the largest naval training facility in the world at Great Lakes as part of my district. Impact Aid is very important to this Member personally, as well as very important to a number of Members in the House of Representatives and to most of our States.

Mr. Chairman, we have done everything we possibly can to raise funding

in this area. In 1996, we provided \$693 million, and in 1998, we provide \$796 million, a \$100 million increase. We have increased section (f). We have increased construction. The President suggested \$4 million for this account; we are raising it to \$7 million, almost double what the President has suggested. We have raised funding for Federal property. It is a high priority with me, and I know that the gentleman from Arizona realizes this.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment would quintuple the appropriation for construction in a single year and would represent more than a sixfold increase over the President's request. That level of funding certainly has not been justified or even suggested in any of the budget hearings we held this year.

Regarding the offset, the committee bill already reduces NLRB by \$11.8 million below the President's request. It provides level funding compared to fiscal year 1997. I have to say that the NLRB was funded at \$170.3 million in fiscal 1996. It would be funded in fiscal 1998 at \$174.6 million, a very, very small increase over the last 3 years.

In total, the NLRB is funded at \$1.4 million below the amount provided by the last Democratic Congress in fiscal year 1995. And when one considers that the NLRB budget is almost entirely salaries and expenses, this 1 percent reduction since 1995 is actually closer to a 10-percent real cut, because the Agency has had to absorb mandatory pay and benefit increases in each of the last 3 years.

Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman from Arizona that I am no fan of this administration's NLRB. I think in many instances Chairman Gould has politicized the institution beyond anybody's imagination, and I feel that that is a serious problem for our country. But I would also say to the gentleman that the NLRB is part of a system that we have devised to resolve disputes in our economic system between management and labor in a lawful way without violence; hopefully, without interruptions of work. Its day-to-day work in resolving cases that are filed before it is very important. When we cut too heavily into an agency's resources, all we do is create a backlog of cases that makes it much more difficult for these disputes to be resolved in a reasonable way. I do not think that simply cutting its budget is a productive approach at all, even given our frustration over the political nature that I believe Chairman Gould has given to this Agency, and I think very unfortunately.

So on balance, I think we have done very well by Impact Aid and very well by Impact Aid construction. I think the cut in NLRB, while in certain ways I would agree with the gentleman from Arizona, would be unwise in this circumstance.

We have level-funded it. It amounts to a cut. I think the committee has done a very good job in creating a balance between these two accounts, and I

would ask Members to oppose the amendment.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PORTER. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I am well aware of the challenges faced by both the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking minority member, and the many different priorities that one tries to weigh and the compromises that must occur in a legislative body to get work done.

Mr. Chairman, let me simply ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], to take a look at the number of attorneys per commissioner or board member.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] has expired.

(On request of Mr. HAYWORTH, and by unanimous consent, Mr. PORTER was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would continue to yield, each board member of the NLRB has anywhere from 18 to 22 lawyers on his staff and yet, as I understand it, here across the street in our third branch of Government at the Supreme Court, the Justices of the Supreme Court have anywhere from two to three, maybe at the most five lawyers on their staffs as law clerks.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would say to the gentleman that they do very different work. I do not see how that is comparable.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would continue to yield, I think it is very important. It may be different work, but certainly an entirely separate branch of Government in the Supreme Court has work of no less importance. And yet to see the numbers of folks employed at the NLRB and to see the extravagance I think is a great concern, especially when we contrast it with the blight and the poverty on many Indian reservations and the needs on many military bases and in the schools there.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, again reclaiming my time, the work of the Supreme Court is controlled by the Court itself. There are very few cases that can be appealed to the Supreme Court, except by writ of certiorari, and they control what cases they will hear.

The NLRB has no control over its caseload. It has to hear what cases are filed before it. And while obviously it does the best it can to resolve those without formal hearings, it still takes formal hearings in many instances. And, again, all we do by making severe cuts in their budget is to create a huge backlog of cases, which is I think in neither in the interest of management or labor.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think we should kid ourselves for a moment. In

my view, this amendment does not have a whole lot to do with Impact Aid. What it does have a lot to do with is that it represents the third year in a row that certain Members of this House have decided that they wanted to wage a frontal attack on the ability of the NLRB to enforce worker rights.

Mr. Chairman, in 1996, the majority in this House cut funding for the NLRB by 30 percent. That was one of the issues involved in the Government shutdown.

In 1997, they tried to cut funding for the NLRB by 15 percent. This amendment cuts it by 10 percent and simply has a "holy picture" place that it puts the money.

Mr. Chairman, I would simply make the point that whether my colleagues like the NLRB, or whether they do not, it is the only agency we have that protects workers against unfair treatment by employers and protects corporations against unfair picketing and violence by unions. To the extent that we reduce its budget, we cripple its ability to deal with both problems.

I would point out that this is the Agency that is charged with the responsibility of giving workers redress when they are fired for an unfair reason, such as trying to organize a union. It is also the Agency charged with the responsibility of seeing to it that when corporations who have contracts with their workers downsize, that they do so in a fair manner, consistent with the contracts that they have negotiated, and not arbitrarily savage people outside of the requirements of law.

Mr. Chairman, this reduction will result in the doubling of the backlog of cases at the NLRB. It will represent a 14-percent cut in staff. This is not, as the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] has suggested, a choice between children and bureaucrats. This is a question of whether or not workers are going to have taken away from them the ability to go to an agency of Government for redress of their grievances when they feel they have been treated unfairly by the corporate entity that employs them. Pure and simple, that is what this amendment is.

Mr. Chairman, I would strongly urge that the House reject the amendment. If we do not like decisions that are made by executive agencies of the Federal Government, the way to go about that is to argue with the fellow who appointed them in the first place. But we should not, under the guise of improving slightly funding for Impact Aid, we should not be savaging the ability of this Government to provide a square deal to every worker who sweats for his wages 40 hours a week.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the observations of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY]. I just wonder if my colleague would answer this question. Does the gentleman

honestly believe that the several hundred lawyers who work for the NLRB are toiling by the sweat of their brow to help, when we see the extravagance?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would ask that the gentleman not misconstrue my remarks.

□ 1630

I said that it is workers throughout the country who have a right to go to their Government for redress when they have been treated unfairly. Those workers work very hard and they work and sweat very often, which is a lot more than can be said about either the gentleman or me in this place. I would appreciate it if the gentleman would not mischaracterize my remarks.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I appreciate the gentleman's point of view and the passion that he brings to this.

Mr. OBEY. With all due respect, Mr. Chairman, it is not my point of view that I want the gentleman to appreciate. I want him to be accurate about what I said on the floor.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, this argument, and my good friend from Arizona has some connections in North Carolina, this kind of befuddles me a little bit. We are not pitting poor children in Arizona or in North Carolina, where we have many bases, I have been a strong supporter of impact aid ever since I have been in this place.

We talk about the NLRB. I was not happy with the structure of the NLRB, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] is not happy with this administration's NLRB appointees, I was not happy with the ones that were in the Ford administration, in the Reagan administration, even the Carter administration, I was not too happy with the board there. But that is not the argument.

The NLRB gives people that work for a living, if they have a grievance and have not been treated fairly, they have someplace to go. They mediate this. This has nothing to do with impact aid.

I would like to make one other point, if my information is correct, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CHRISTENSEN] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS] testified to the level of funding for impact aid, and it was only \$2 million less than the request for impact aid, and they testified and supported that level.

That was satisfactory with the impact aid people, NAFIS; that was satisfactory with them. That was the level that they agreed to, and the chairman and the ranking member put it in the bill. There was no great concern that I am aware of that the gentlemen contested the level of funding, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH], the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CHRISTENSEN], or the gentleman from

Texas [Mr. EDWARDS]. They agreed that this was basically fair and would get the job done.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEFNER. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I appreciate the gentleman's comments, but he is wrong. In fact, I testified for an increase of close to \$20 million when I appeared before the subcommittee.

Mr. HEFNER. OK, Mr. Chairman, I stand corrected. And I apologize. But the gentleman said this is pitting poor children against bureaucrats and lawyers. That is not really what we are doing here. All the Members that I know here, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], myself, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS], we have been supporters of impact aid for years and years and years.

In fact, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] led the fight when Mr. Natcher was chairman of this committee to increase funding for impact aid. So to say that and make the determination that what we are doing is denying money to these poor children, impact aid, and you are going to give it to bureaucrats that do not do anything, that is not really a fair characterization.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEFNER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, as has been the case often in the last 3 days, agencies are being pummeled for the sins of their predecessors. I would point out that the building into which the NLRB moved was a building, they were moved into that building under the Bush administration. The showers were in that building when the Bush administration moved the agency into that building.

Second, I would point out that the linen service that the gentleman is so exercised about was discontinued 2 years ago. So I do not mind attacking agencies for mistakes that they are making at the present, but I do not believe that people should be blamed for the mistakes of either previous administrations or be blamed for practices that have been long since corrected.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would like to finish my statement. I think what we should do is pursue active funding for impact aid for our military bases for quality of life programs which the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] and I have worked very hard to do, to see that we can have retention for qualified people in our military. But I do not think that it is really kosher for us to come here and pretend to say that if you are going to give this money to NLRB that all these people are going to suffer so much because they do not get the impact aid. This seems to me not a real good, honest argument to make.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEFNER. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, perhaps the gentleman misunderstands the argument. That is not the theory I posited. What I am saying is that when we come to this floor through the amendments process, as my colleague from North Carolina who has served ably in this Chamber for many years understands, this is the chance for us as a collective body to sit down and say, let us review the priorities and the work done by the various committees.

With reference to the ranking member's historical observation about the Bush administration and moving the NLRB into that rather exorbitant headquarters, and that is fine, I am not here to retrace partisan history, if something is wrong, then it is wrong. We ought to take a look at making sure that the NLRB can operate effectively but more economically in other areas.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, this is not the argument. We are not talking about funding for the NLRB right now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HEFNER was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, we are not talking about posh offices, showers and all of these sorts of things. We are talking about impact aid. The impact aid, if the gentleman is opposed to NLRB, maybe he should have an amendment to do away with any funding for NLRB, but to make the case, which the gentleman said earlier, do you want to put the money in for Washington bureaucrats, all these special lawyers and what have you, and take it away from these poor children in Arizona and North Carolina and wherever, that is just not, in my view, that is not a real intellectually honest amendment to make at this time.

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment which would benefit both our military schoolchildren as well as those children living on the Indian reservations.

As many of my colleagues know, the Impact Aid funding for section 8007 of the construction has been short-changed over the years. The Federal Government backed away from providing construction funding through the Impact Aid Program several years ago.

In my district, funds for construction costs are needed in a variety of important areas. Checking with our local school administration, I talked with one superintendent. He was talking about making some of the bathrooms handicap accessible. We had a remodeling of one that cost over \$32,000. In the Bellevue school system alone, in my district, we have had 20 bathrooms that

have been made handicap accessible, but still have 15 that need to be done.

Bellevue West Senior High School is 20 years old and is in need of roof replacement. This will cost over \$1 million. Just to cable an elementary school for technology costs approximately \$30,000. Upgrading the electrical service for technology costs approximately \$65,000. One computer lab in the elementary school costs approximately \$100,000.

Appropriations for the Impact Aid construction in the Labor-HHS bill amount to about \$7 million. If this amendment passes, that amount would rise to \$25 million. These needed funds could be used to help school districts address the problems that I have mentioned so that federally impacted school kids will have access to safe facilities with modern technology.

I want to really praise the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations here, because he has been a real champion. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] has been working for a long time, and I want to thank him for all his efforts because he has been a true champion. And this area is really about where we can take some money that we think is not being wisely used and put it into an area that can benefit all of us.

The NLRB, as we heard already, has not been the most efficient use of the taxpayer dollars, whether it was in the Bush administration or the current administration. I believe that is why we take a look at this idea of spending more money in the areas of education for the kids of our military families versus spending it on whether it is rank and file NLRB employees or whether it is some of the lawyers we have heard about, that I think there is over 628 lawyers at NLRB with an average salary of \$76,000 a year.

Now, some have complained that we are pitting the NLRB bureaucrats versus schoolchildren. That is not fair. Let us not look at it that way. Let us look at how we can use our tax dollars in a more efficient manner.

We believe that putting the dollars into the construction and into the education of military kids is a higher priority than spending money on all the 628 lawyers at the NLRB. It is a simple choice and it is a choice that I think we can easily make.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH].

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Nebraska and would like to commend both sides for the candor involved in this debate.

Mr. Chairman, just going back to some comments made earlier, no one here is suggesting, as has been implied or perhaps stated, that we seek a destruction of the National Labor Relations Board. We understand the importance and value of having a place where labor and management, where workers can go to settle grievances, the framework which exists. But again, as we look at priorities and we deal as

a collective body with the recommendations of the appropriations subcommittee, I believe we are well within our rights to ask the legitimate question, given the extravagance that we see at the posh Washington, DC, address.

Mr. Chairman, I would just invite our friends in the television networks, and NBC comes to mind with the series, *The Fleecing of America*, I think they might want to go down and visit the NLRB and take a look at what has become, in essence, a Taj Mahal which stands in stark contrast to schools that are below standards in Timbuktu that we see in many areas of our Nation, particularly on our Indian reservations and military bases.

I respectfully, again, would reinforce the notion that we have an opportunity here to redirect some funding, not to eliminate an agency but to redirect our priorities, because, Mr. Chairman, the simple fact is this, if this amendment passes, workers will still have a National Labor Relations Board to go to. But if this amendment fails to pass, many children will still lack adequate places to go to school.

It is a simple, stark contrast that compels us to adopt this amendment.

Again, I thank my colleague from Nebraska and also our colleague from Mississippi, from whom we will hear a bit later in this debate, for the bipartisan nature of this amendment, because it does what this House is supposed to do, rethink priorities and deal with pressing problems.

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I urge a yes vote on this amendment. I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member also for the work on the Impact Aid Department.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. Many of my colleagues who have worked with me as colleagues in this House in prior Congresses know how hard I have worked, diligently, to express the needs of children from military families, both who live on base and off base. We argued this each year in trying to get additional funds for Impact Aid.

I have to take this opportunity to commend the committee for understanding the importance of this assistance to our local communities and steadily, over recent years, enormous amounts of money, compared to past Congresses, have been allocated to this program. So they certainly need to have our commendation. And the total Impact Aid funding for this year, as recommended in this bill, is nearly \$800 million. That will be added on to by the moneys that are allocated in the defense bill.

So I think that the Congress should be commended, not castigated, which I have to interpret as the nature of this amendment, by asking that the committee did not act properly by not giving enough money. If I were a member

of the Committee on Appropriations, I would take offense. I would stand up strongly and say that the needs of the children in the Impact Aid communities have been more than adequately listened to when compared to the other needs in the entire education area.

All of us are frustrated by the fact that we do not have enough money to provide for the educational needs of this country. Take the President's recommendation in construction, because this is what we are talking about here today, \$18 million more of construction aid for Impact Aid schools. What happened to the President's recommendation for \$5 billion in school construction? Talk about priorities of this country.

All of us come from school districts where the apparent needs of our schools are not only in the classroom but overhead, because we have leaky roofs, inadequate facilities. And somehow in the compromise that was made by the Republican leadership and the White House and others, we were unable to come up with the \$5 billion we need for school construction.

So let us not talk about weighing priorities. Let us not talk about weighing priorities, because we had the opportunity right there to do something about the overall dismal condition of our school apparatus and infrastructure and hooking up to high-technology and so forth, and we did not. We failed the school system. But my colleagues do not find me here on the floor of the House castigating the Committee on Appropriations for not coming up with this money which I feel is so strongly needed by our school system.

□ 1645

I believe in the Impact Aid Program, and I would stand firm with anyone in this House to advocate for additional funds, but I believe that this committee has done well by us in this bill and I do not believe that coming in here under the guise of adding \$18 million in an \$800 million budget for Impact Aid is really what this is all about.

What this is about is to take 10 percent of the money away from the NLRB because there is a move being made here by the Republican leadership to cut down on the protections of our workers. They do not want occupational health and safety, they do not want anything there that helps workers in our communities protect their meager earnings, overtime pay and rightful minimum wage and so forth.

And now they want to take the last thing that they have, that challenges their right to belong to a union, to bring their grievances of unfair labor practices to a national board where these matters can be litigated and ironed out.

So what we have here today is not an effort to add \$18 million to Impact Aid school construction. We had that opportunity already and we blew it. This is an effort to try to cut down the pro-

tections of workers, as well as management, to have their legitimate concerns and complaints heard by an independent board to determine where the equities are and to settle these matters in as quick and as efficient a manner as is possible.

This board has not had additional funding this year. They are level-funded. And I am handed a piece of paper that says that over the course of time they have had to cut back on their staff. More than a third of their staff has been cut since 1980, 25 percent since 1985, and another additional 10 percent since 1991. So we are talking about the crunching in of the staff that is so essential.

It is high personnel costs because that is what their job is. So I plead with this House to vote down this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] has expired.

(On request of Mr. OBEY, and by unanimous consent, Mrs. MINK was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for the courtesy because I feel very strongly about this.

I do not want to see this pairing or challenging of issues here and penalizing the people who come to this House with legitimate concerns, to have them try to balance it out. I am here full square as a defender of the Impact Aid Program. I shall vote against this amendment because it is not an honest effort to add Impact Aid moneys, but it is an effort to challenge a system, the only system we have that will protect the workers of this country to the right to collective bargaining.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to reemphasize something that the gentlewoman is saying. This agency's staffing has been reduced by more than one-third since 1980, from 3,000 people to under 2,000; by more than 25 percent since 1985.

The staffing level for fiscal 1996 was the lowest since 1962, and yet their case intake was 56 percent higher. Each employee must now handle 28 percent more cases than in 1985.

I understand that when various labor unions campaign against individual Members of Congress, that when legislation comes to the floor Members have an opportunity to offer amendments which reduce the ability of the agencies to protect legitimate rights of workers; and I understand that that can happen under the rules of the House, but that does not make the amendments that might be offered any more advisable.

It seems to me that we should not, under the banner of cutting the so-called bureaucrats in Washington, actually be gutting the Government in its responsibility to protect workers and to protect corporations from unfair

practices by unions. That is what the effect of this amendment would be, and I think it deserves to be defeated on both sides of the aisle.

This amendment, were it to pass, would not survive conference. If it did, there would not be a bill. There is no way the President of the United States is going to accept a gutting of his responsibility to enforce the law to protect workers' rights in this country, and it is just that simple.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I would like to urge this House to consider this amendment for what it is, and it is a 10-percent cut of the National Labor Relations Board, whose staff works very, very diligently.

Most of the money allocated, the \$117 million, is for payroll. If they abide by the law and accord these workers their legitimate COLA increases, it will force them to decrease the number even under the current funding. So I plead with this House to reject this amendment on the basis of what it is.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I listened with great interest to the comments of my colleague from Hawaii and also to the comments of the ranking minority member.

If I am not mistaken, it was not but just a few moments ago when my colleague from Wisconsin pointed out that it should not be my intent to mischaracterize words or his reasoning. I would simply ask for the same courtesy from both the ranking minority member and the distinguished gentleman from Hawaii. For if it were my purpose, Mr. Chairman, to destroy or eliminate the National Labor Relations Board, I would offer that amendment.

Again, that is not our intent here. We believe there is a legitimate right for the National Labor Relations Board to work, to operate, to deal with workers' needs, but again it becomes a question of priorities.

Now, Mr. Chairman, my friend from Hawaii brought up the President's proposal for 5 billion dollars' worth of funds for school construction. And just to point out, when she asked the question, where is the support for that program, it is worth noting, Mr. Chairman, as I think most Members know, that that \$5 billion would not, would not have gone to schools under the aegis of impact aid because they are in areas that have no adequate tax base or bonding capacity. And as we know, that was a prerequisite for the funding, the \$5 billion package, offered earlier by the administration.

Indeed, as we have talked about and heard from the minority side evidence of so many cuts, just for the record, last year we may recall the House-passed 1997 appropriations bill included

a 15-percent decrease for the NLRB, but after conference with the Senate, the agency ended up with a 3-percent increase.

What I would ask, Mr. Chairman, is again for our friends in the fourth estate, and some call broadcasting the fifth estate, to take a look at the extravagance at the National Labor Relations Board, the veritable Taj Mahal in downtown Washington, and ask if that is a legitimate edifice, if that extravagant headquarters in fact really helps workers' rights.

I appreciate the fact the ranking minority member talked about the efficiency and doing more with less, by his account, that the NLRB states. I am saying with this amendment, as colleagues on both sides of the aisle are saying, as we are looking at priorities, this is a proper venue to take money from an organization that can perform well and that will continue to perform well and put the money where it is needed.

Again, I thank the subcommittee chairman for the slight increase to \$7 million in school construction. But as the National Association of Federally Impacted Schools states in its study and its request, that organization says we should fully fund this to \$25 million. It is that request that I believe we should honor. It is in that spirit that we offer the amendment.

Even as I appreciate the fact that there are profound philosophical differences on both sides of the aisle, there is also some uniformity and some recognition of need here; and that is why we come with this amendment today, again to make the choice of how best to spend this \$18 million.

It is desperately needed by federally impacted schools. We must adopt this amendment, the protestations of the minority notwithstanding.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I think more eloquent than anything I can say, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that this amendment, that is proposed to supposedly help impact aid, has drawn opposition from some of the strongest supporters of impact aid in this Congress.

I know of no one, since the death of Mr. Natcher, who has done more personally, individually, singularly to increase funding and to defend funding for impact aid than our chairman from Illinois, who has worked tirelessly where the real decisions were being made, behind the scenes, in subcommittee, in committee, to fully fund this program as much as we can within the limited budget. For the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] to stand up in opposition to this is something that I think speaks more eloquently than anything I could say.

But as cochairman of the House Impact Aid Coalition, as someone who helped found the House Impact Aid Coalition several years ago, because I felt the military children and the native

American children of America needed a voice on this important issue, I want to stand in opposition to this amendment because I believe, while well intended by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH], I think this proposal, this effort, is going to harm the Impact Aid Program.

Let me mention two points: First is impact aid has already been treated very well, exceptionally well within the context of a budget where we have been cutting funding for senior citizen programs, cutting back on services to veterans, and cutting back on defense programs.

The fact is that this program is being increased in this fiscal year because of the work of the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Wisconsin and others in committee from \$730 million to \$796 million, a \$66 million increase, when most other programs are being cut.

The fact is, the NAFIS organization which supports impact aid actually put out, in its own newsletter before they were asked about this amendment, that this funding is within \$2 million of even their request. And I do not know of many groups who make requests before Congress that get them 99 percent funded, certainly not in this balanced budget context.

NAFIS also said in their July 29, 1997, newsletter, NAFIS does not expect any changes to these figures during consideration of the appropriations bills before the full House and Senate. Through separate letters, NAFIS has urged all members of the House and Senate Impact Aid Coalitions to support the respective Labor-HHS, Education appropriations bills.

The interest group out there with whom I work to support impact aid has said this was a very fair bill, it was a generous bill.

Now, let me tell the gentleman, my friend, whom I usually work together with, three reasons I think he is actually harming, not intentionally, but actually harming impact aid.

First, we are sending a message to the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Wisconsin and to all the others who work on the Committee on Appropriations that enough is never enough, so that next year, if we got another \$66 million increase in spending for impact aid coming out of the committee, that is not enough. There will be floor amendments making other cuts in their budget proposals.

So what that says to the gentleman from Illinois, the gentleman from Wisconsin, or others who might be serving in their position, go on and reduce the committee proposal, the recommendation for impact aid, and then let the gentleman from Arizona and the gentleman from Texas come to the floor and ask for an extra \$5 or \$10 or \$15 million.

The bottom line will be, because of efforts like this on the floor that turn their backs, in effect, on the great increase in funding for impact aid coming out of committee, we are actually

encouraging the Committee on Appropriations next year to appropriate less.

Second, as someone who helped found the Impact Aid Coalition, I think one of our real successes has been we have had no predators, no natural enemies to this program. Now we have, because of this amendment on the floor today, we have labor unions making calls to Members on both sides of the aisle asking them to vote against this funding for impact aid.

Some of those folks may have thought impact aid in the past was a highway program; I do not know. But now we have natural predators.

We are also sending a message to others that are funded through this bill that next year they had better watch it because NAFIS and the impact aid folks, even if they get an increase, unlike most people in their committee recommendation for funding, they are going to be out there on the floor finding some other area to cut.

So the practical impact of this is that the committee is going to make recommendations for less funding next year, and other groups will look to impact aid and perhaps want to have floor amendments taking money from impact aid to put in their pockets.

Now, the third reason, unintentionally, I say to my friend, why I think this amendment does harm to impact aid is that we are tearing down—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. EDWARDS was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman and I are cochair of the Impact Aid Coalition. We worked hard to build a bipartisan effort. Yet when this amendment was put together, our coalition never met. Most Members I have talked to did not hear from the gentleman. I even have a letter signed now by a lot of members of the steering committee and cochair of the Impact Aid Coalition, opposing this amendment.

And while the gentleman does have some fine Democrats, such as the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR] supporting this, and I respect that, the fact is, this was not put together with the broad support of the Impact Aid Coalition. So I think the gentleman is tending to tear down the true bipartisan, nonpartisan nature of the Impact Aid Coalition.

□ 1700

For those three reasons, I think unintentionally, this amendment is actually hurting our efforts. I will say that to NAFIS or to any other organization that cares about impact aid. I believe in helping military children get a first-class education and, Mr. Chairman, that is exactly why I am going to strongly and actively oppose this amendment. While well intended, so is the path to hell and this is an example of well intentions going wrong.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS] has again expired.

(On request of Mr. HAYWORTH, and by unanimous consent, Mr. EDWARDS was allowed to proceed for 1½ additional minutes.)

Mr. EDWARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas, with whom I agree on a great many subjects, but hearing his last observation about the path paved with good intentions, it tempts me to remind him that I will just go back to my district and be sure to tell those kids in dilapidated schools that in his opinion they are being treated well because he and I both know and, Mr. Chairman, I think this body knows that we have schools literally falling apart, federally impacted schools. While I joined and sat alongside with the gentleman from Texas to testify and to talk to members of this subcommittee, the fact also remains that in the school construction budget, section 8007, the increase was marginal and woefully inadequate. And the amendments process is not intended as an insult to the Committee on Appropriations, as my colleague, the gentleman from Texas, is well aware, a colleague to whom I tried to reach out in preparation of this amendment, and we had an honest difference of opinion on this but we have this process again to bring to the floor of this Chamber an open airing of priorities and to give Members a chance to say we believe despite the good work of the committee some things can be done even better, as I see the dilapidated state of federally impacted schools in the Sixth District of Arizona, and I will read a portion of the statement from the National Association of Federally Impacted Schools in support of the Hayworth-Taylor amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS] has again expired.

(On request of Mr. HAYWORTH, and by unanimous consent, Mr. EDWARDS was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. HAYWORTH. "When Congress reauthorized the Impact Aid law in 1994 and created section 8007, it envisioned this part of the Impact Aid Program to be funded at a minimum of \$25 million each year. Section 8007 has only been appropriated at \$5 million each of the last few years. Currently the House bill includes \$7 million for section 8007."

What we see here is not in gratitude but a simple statement of fact and intent. While again I join with my colleague, the gentleman from Texas, on behalf of federally impacted schools and impact aid, this shows again why we should add these funds, why we should respect not only the committee process but the amendments process and pass this amendment.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition and I am sorry to have to do this, particularly because I value my friendship with the gentleman from Arizona and with my dear friend, the gentleman from Mississippi, as well. As someone on the steering committee of the impact aid coalition and someone who was education chair in my State and had to try and deal with the implications of the failure to have the level of funding necessary for impact aid, I find myself in this uncomfortable position of having to oppose the amendment. I hope, actually, by the time this discussion is over they maybe would consider withdrawing it or not bringing it to a vote in the hopes that we will not end up in a situation where people can say, "Oh, well, I was for impact aid and you were against impact aid." Because, very frankly, and I hope that we can get attention for everything that is being said from everyone before we are through, that when this comes down to a question of funding, which is what it does, we are actually in the wrong venue.

This should be a line item in the Department of Defense budget. This is not a position, I would tell the gentleman from Arizona, that I am just coming up with in response to this amendment. This argument goes back to an argument I had as chair of the education committee in the State of Hawaii and brought up here to Washington almost 2 decades ago. This should be a line item in the Department of Defense budget. For those Members who do not know this, we fund our schools overseas at 100 cents on the dollar. Not my answer to the gentleman from Arizona, but my response, and I trust he would understand the difference both from a political sense and personally, is that I not only understand the capital problem that he is having, the capital assets problem in terms of the facilities in the school, but also in paying the teachers and in the operating expenses that are involved. To have the children, the dependents of our military personnel, dependent on the particular circumstances of property taxes, however we do the funding in Arizona or Hawaii or Mississippi or elsewhere, is virtually, from my point of view, immoral. It is not fair. Those children are there by the assignment of the U.S. Government and their parents are there in our name acting in our behalf, and this should be funded out of the Department of Defense as an obligation.

If we can fund our schools at 100 cents on the dollar in Korea, in Germany, or wherever, and I suppose if things keep on going, in Bosnia by the time we get through, then we should certainly do it in the confines and the boundaries of the United States of America.

My first essential point to the gentleman is that rather than pit workers against children or one element of government against another element of government, or however people choose

to characterize this debate for their own purposes, not for ours in terms of our discussion, we are going to end up with that kind of a dichotomy being put forward, and I believe it is a false dichotomy. I do not doubt for a moment that the funding is needed in exactly the way that he says it is, and I would support it. This is why I think we should work together within the coalition, and this is no news to those who know of my participation in the coalition, that we should move this, and I would like to work with the gentleman, and anybody else who is interested in it, in moving the whole funding nexus from the Department of Education and into where it properly belongs, into the Department of Defense.

Pending that, I think it is an exercise not so much in futility, but an exercise in false confrontation or false dichotomy to try to pull the money from, whether it is NLRB or wherever else it might have come from, in order to do the necessary funding here. We need to make the fight, it seems to me, on the basis of the merits of the Impact Aid Program across the board and that that should be funded as a result of our commitment to the dependents of our military personnel across the board.

I do want to say that rather than continue in a vein as to which one of us is more morally correct or whether or not one is depriving an essential necessity of governmental operation in the United States of the funding necessary to do its job in order to benefit the children.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ABERCROMBIE was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Rather than get into that and rather than allowing this very important discussion to merely become another point in the overall budget discussion of this particular bill, I plead with the gentleman from Arizona, let us take this up in another venue, at another time, working together, Democrats and Republicans, on behalf of all the children, on behalf of our military personnel so that we can deal with the issue where it should be dealt with within the Department of Defense budget. I would be happy to work with him and my good friend from Mississippi and anybody else who is interested.

I thank the gentleman for his kind attention, and I hope my remarks are received in the temper that I meant them in the first place, that is, that we need to focus on the children, we can focus on the children and perhaps if this discussion keeps going with this particular amendment, that might be lost regardless of the good intentions of the author.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I regret that a lot of good people in this debate have chosen

to question other people's motives. I am not going to do that. I will ask some people that I know to have good hearts to think for a second and let us try to set some priorities and let us try to set some priorities involving our Nation's children. For those Members who do not have a military base in their district and therefore may not be familiar with Impact Aid, it is a program designed to help pay the cost of children whose parents either live on a base, work on a base or do both.

In my hometown of Bay St. Louis, about 60 percent of my property taxes go toward paying for the schools, building the schools and paying the administrators. About half of the sales tax, which is the majority of State taxes that are collected in Mississippi, go to paying classroom teachers. But if a person is in the military, if they serve at Keesler Air Force Base or the Navy construction battalion and they happen to live on that base, well, then they do not pay property tax. They are serving their country, but they do not pay property tax. Therefore, they are not contributing directly toward the building of those schools in Gulfport and in Biloxi. If they shop on the base, and many of them do because they are underpaid, so we provide base commissaries for them to shop and save some money, at that base commissary they do not pay sales tax. Therefore, they are not paying toward the cost of that classroom teacher, \$26,000 in the State of Mississippi alone.

So a very good program was started and defended over the years that says since we are placing a burden on these local communities when we send the children from these bases to the local schools, we will help subsidize the local school district. But even that falls horribly short. Nationwide, we spend about \$5,500 to educate a child between the age of kindergarten and 12th grade. Impact Aid contributes only about \$1,500 to those local school districts where the parent lives on the base, works on the base or does both.

So even with the great progress made this year, and I do want to commend the committee for doing so, we are still way below the cost of educating these children. We are a long way from where we should be. What the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] and I want to do, though, is there is a separate circumstance, those circumstances where over half of the young students are the children whose parents live on a base, work on a base or they happen to be on an Indian reservation. These are the most remote areas of America where we do our military training so we do not bother the neighbors, so we do not hurt innocent bystanders. And so the base is the community. If the base is the community, then there is no local school district to subsidize. So the base has to build a school.

With the defense drawdown, and there has been a drawdown, the defense budget has gone from \$300 billion in 1990 to about \$270 billion this year. It

has been cut \$30 billion in real money, and if we throw inflation on that, it has probably been cut by \$50 billion. What the gentleman from Arizona and hopefully a number of my other colleagues are saying is, do you not think those kids deserve a good school? If their parents are in the Navy, they are away from them 180 days a year. I will say that again. If their mom or dad is in the Navy, in all likelihood, they are gone from their children 180 days a year. If they are in the Army in all likelihood, mom or dad is away from those children 150 days a year; if they are in the Air Force, 120 days a year. We cannot make up for these things in money. We are taking their time away from them, the most valuable thing they have, especially when they are little.

□ 1715

God knows we do not pay them enough, because we have 13,000 soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines on food stamps. Where I come from, that is an embarrassment. I do not think the people who serve our country ought to be embarrassed like that.

So all we are trying to say is if we cannot pay them enough, and they have got to be gone all the time, and because Congress will not take a stand on whether or not to let the President send people all over the world, to let him do what we will not do with the War Powers Act, and we are sending parents away to Bosnia, and we are sending parents to the desert, and we sent parents to Panama and all over the world, why do we not try to make up for it in some small way, to see to it that the kids go to a decent school on base?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, again, this is our responsibility. We are not talking about a school district in Mississippi, we are not talking about a school district in your hometown, we are talking about those schools where over half of the students are the children of the people in our Nation's military. It is our responsibility to see to it they are treated fairly.

So it is not bureaucracy versus schools. It is simply setting priorities. Should we not be responsible for those children and should we not treat them properly?

I have got to admit I am a little disappointed when I see Democrat after Democrat come up here and lambast the motives. That is my motive. I think those kids deserve a decent school.

I regret as the ranking Democrat on the Subcommittee on Personnel, I could not find the money to get those 13,000 people off of food stamps. But do you know what? Maybe I can give some

of their kids a little bit better school to go to.

All we are asking is that we as a Nation set some priorities within the funds that we have, since we are trying to balance our budget. One of those priorities will be to shift some money out of the city of Washington, DC, and spend it on the people who serve our country, to see to it that their kids can go to a decent school.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Hayworth amendment and urge our colleagues to vote against it.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to, with all the respect in the world for the previous speaker, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR], I would like to address some of the statements that the gentleman made as well.

Certainly the gentleman laid out a magnificent justification for funding for Impact Aid, and I agree with the gentleman completely. As one who had three bases in her district up until the Base Closure Commission closed all three of them, I certainly identify with the concerns and the values that the gentleman put forth and the need for us to have this Impact Aid.

That is why I congratulate our chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], and our ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], for increasing the funding in this bill to \$796 million, an increase of \$66 million from last year, for Impact Aid. Indeed, Impact Aid is a high priority for our subcommittee, as is reflected in this amount of money, in the \$66 million increase, that was given.

The gentleman referenced that he does not like the idea of questioning the motives of other Members of Congress, and neither do I. But I will, when I think that the Republican majority is, once again, for about the fifth day in a row, hiding behind the children of America, to make an assault, to continue its assault, on the American worker, and that is what this amendment is about. That is what this amendment is about.

If we want to have bigger increases in our education programs, and I fully support that, then we have to take a look at our entire budget and how we allocate the 602(b) allocation so that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] does not once again in this lamb-eat-lamb subcommittee bill, because everything in here we can make a strong case for and a strong justification for, that is where I would like to see our Republican colleagues weigh in for more funding for education, instead of tax breaks for the wealthiest in our country and increased funding on the defense side without question.

I agree with our colleague, the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE], that this, indeed, should be a line item in the defense budget, and I commend a member of the Impact Aid Task Force, the gentleman from North Caro-

lina [Mr. HEFNER], the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Military Construction, for the leadership he has demonstrated in funding and building schools out of that budget for children of the military.

The gentleman from Texas, our colleague [Mr. EDWARDS], is a cochair of the Impact Aid Task Force, and a champion in that regard, and he spoke eloquently in opposition to the Hayworth amendment.

But I do question the motives of the Republican majority to day in and day out hide behind children. The first day it was children with disabilities, the next day it was vocational education, it was the education of our Nation's children, and then alternating back and forth, children with special needs, voc-ed, et cetera, in order to take money that is there to promote tranquility in the workplace.

The National Labor Relations Board has a freeze in this budget which represents a 5 percent cut in staffing because the freeze does not enable them to keep up with inflation.

This amendment, in addition to that, guts enforcement of the Nation's labor laws that protect workers. The amendment not only guts protections for workers against unfair firings, it reduces protection for companies. This is about workers and about companies. Both benefit from the work of the National Labor Relations Board.

The Hayworth amendment would reduce protection for companies against unfair picketing and violence in strikes. The amendment would reduce staffing levels by 14 percent over and above the reductions that our freeze already impacts, investigations would double or triple, and election cases would be delayed up to 3 months.

The bill of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] is a bipartisan product. It balances the needs, the competing needs, of the very worthy competing needs that our subcommittee's jurisdiction of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education presents.

I believe that in our national budget should be a statement of our national values. It is an honor to serve on this subcommittee, because we address the heart of the matter, jobs, job training, health and the well-being of the American people, and the education, the education of our children.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Ms. PELOSI was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I, therefore, call upon our colleagues to once again reject this attempt on the part of the Republican majority to continue its assault on American workers by hiding behind their children. Every day that I serve in this House I will say that we can talk all we want about the well-being of our children and their education, but the economic security of their families is absolutely essential to that.

The Hayworth amendment undercuts that economic security. I urge our colleagues to vote no.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I have listened for days now to the debate over education appropriations. I would like to add my voice to the debate and say our kids deserve more than what Congress wants to give them. They deserve well-built schools and classrooms, qualified teachers, and a chance to learn in a safe classroom and secure environment.

And we should let students know that public schools are quality schools, and that it is not only a wonderful opportunity but a privilege to learn in the public school system. This country's public school system produces some of the most gifted and well-learned students in the world. That is why we need to keep our public schools well funded.

A recent example of how well public schools work in our communities is Watsonville High School, located in my district in California. Two students this year graduated from Watsonville High School were valedictorians of their senior class. Both students came from poverty-stricken, farm-worker families, both students are the first in their families to attend college, but both are high achievers attending top universities this fall. Fabian Bedolla is studying architecture at Cornell University and Sonya Rocher is attending UC-Berkeley.

If we put our much-needed public education funds into vouchers, we take away from these students, who want to succeed, and fulfill their dreams within the public school system. We owe it to our children to keep all of our public school money in the public schools. They are the future of our country, and we must give them the tools to lead us into the next century.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of July 31, 1997, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes an electronic vote, if ordered, on the Schaffer amendment.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 170, noes 253, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 385]

AYES—170

Aderholt	Buyer	Dreier
Archer	Calvert	Duncan
Armey	Cannon	Dunn
Bachus	Chabot	Ehrlich
Baker	Chambliss	Emerson
Ballenger	Chenoweth	Ensign
Barr	Christensen	Everett
Barrett (NE)	Coble	Ewing
Bartlett	Coburn	Fowler
Barton	Collins	Frelinghuysen
Bass	Combest	Gallely
Bereuter	Cook	Ganske
Bilbray	Cooksey	Gibbons
Bliley	Cox	Gillmor
Boehner	Crane	Goode
Bonilla	Crapo	Goodlatte
Bono	Cubin	Goodling
Brady	Cunningham	Goss
Bryant	Deal	Graham
Bunning	DeLay	Granger
Burr	Dickey	Greenwood
Burton	Doolittle	Gutknecht

Hall (TX)	McKeon	Scarborough	Porter	Sensenbrenner	Thurman	Foley	Latham	Sanford
Hansen	Metcalf	Schaefer, Dan	Poshard	Serrano	Tierney	Fowler	LaTourette	Saxton
Hastert	Mica	Schaffer, Bob	Price (NC)	Shaw	Torres	Franks (NJ)	Lewis (KY)	Scarborough
Hastings (WA)	Moran (KS)	Sessions	Quinn	Shays	Towns	Gallegly	Linder	Schaefer, Dan
Hayworth	Myrick	Shadegg	Rahall	Sherman	Traficant	Ganske	LoBiondo	Schaffer, Bob
Hefley	Nethercutt	Skeen	Rangel	Shimkus	Turner	Gekas	Lucas	Sensenbrenner
Herger	Neumann	Smith (MI)	Regula	Shuster	Upton	Gibbons	Manzullo	Sessions
Hill	Ney	Smith (OR)	Reyes	Sisisky	Velazquez	Gillmor	McCollum	Shadegg
Hilleary	Norhup	Smith (TX)	Rivers	Skaggs	Vento	Goode	McCrery	Shaw
Hoekstra	Norwood	Snowbarger	Rodriguez	Skelton	Visclosky	Goodlatte	McInnis	Shays
Hostettler	Nussle	Solomon	Roemer	Slaughter	Walsh	Goodling	McIntosh	Shimkus
Hulshof	Packard	Souder	Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (NJ)	Waters	Goss	McKeon	Skeen
Inglis	Pappas	Spence	Rothman	Smith, Adam	Watt (NC)	Graham	Metcalf	Smith (MI)
Istook	Parker	Stearns	Roukema	Smith, Linda	Weldon (PA)	Granger	Mica	Smith (NJ)
Jenkins	Paul	Stenholm	Roybal-Allard	Snyder	Weller	Greenwood	Moran (KS)	Smith (OR)
Johnson, Sam	Paxon	Stump	Rush	Spratt	Wexler	Gutknecht	Myrick	Smith (TX)
Jones	Peterson (PA)	Sununu	Sabo	Stabenow	Weygand	Hall (TX)	Nethercutt	Smith, Linda
Kasich	Pickering	Talent	Sanchez	Stark	Wise	Hansen	Neumann	Snowbarger
Kelly	Pitts	Tanner	Sanders	Stokes	Wolf	Hastert	Ney	Solomon
Kingston	Pombo	Tauzin	Sandlin	Strickland	Woolsey	Hastings (WA)	Norwood	Souder
Klug	Portman	Taylor (MS)	Sawyer	Stupak	Wynn	Hayworth	Nussle	Spence
Knollenberg	Pryce (OH)	Taylor (NC)	Schumer	Tauscher	Yates	Hefley	Pappas	Stearns
LaHood	Radanovich	Thomas	Scott	Thompson	Young (FL)	Herger	Parker	Stenholm
Largent	Ramstad	Thornberry				Hill	Paul	Stump
Latham	Redmond	Thune				Hilleary	Paxon	Sununu
Lewis (KY)	Riggs	Tiaht	Carson	Gilchrest	Schiff	Hobson	Pease	Talent
Linder	Riley	Wamp	Conyers	Gonzalez	Waxman	Hoekstra	Peterson (PA)	Tauzin
Lucas	Rogan	Watkins	Dellums	Hunter		Hostettler	Petri	Taylor (MS)
Manzullo	Rogers	Watts (OK)	Foglietta	Kolbe		Houghton	Pickering	Taylor (NC)
McCollum	Rohrabacher	Weldon (FL)				Hulshof	Pitts	Thomas
McCrery	Royce	White				Hutchinson	Pombo	Thornberry
McHugh	Ryun	Whitfield				Hyde	Portman	Thune
McInnis	Salmon	Wicker				Inglis	Radanovich	Tiaht
McIntosh	Sanford	Young (AK)				Istook	Redmond	Turner
McIntyre	Saxton					Jenkins	Riggs	Wamp

NOES—253

Abercrombie	English	LaFalce
Ackerman	Eshoo	Lampson
Allen	Etheridge	Lantos
Andrews	Evans	LaTourette
Baesler	Farr	Lazio
Baldacci	Fattah	Leach
Barcia	Fawell	Levin
Barrett (WI)	Fazio	Lewis (CA)
Bateman	Filner	Lewis (GA)
Becerra	Flake	Lipinski
Bentsen	Foley	Livingston
Berman	Forbes	LoBiondo
Berry	Ford	Lofgren
Bilirakis	Fox	Lowey
Bishop	Frank (MA)	Luther
Blagojevich	Franks (NJ)	Maloney (CT)
Blumenauer	Frost	Maloney (NY)
Blunt	Furse	Manton
Boehlert	Gejdenson	Markey
Bonior	Gekas	Martinez
Borski	Gephardt	Mascara
Boswell	Gilman	Matsui
Boucher	Gordon	McCarthy (MO)
Boyd	Green	McCarthy (NY)
Brown (CA)	Gutierrez	McDade
Brown (FL)	Hall (OH)	McDermott
Brown (OH)	Hamilton	McGovern
Callahan	Harman	McHale
Camp	Hastings (FL)	McKinney
Campbell	Hefner	McNulty
Canady	Hilliard	Meehan
Capps	Hinchey	Meek
Cardin	Hinojosa	Menendez
Castle	Hobson	Millender-
Clay	Holden	McDonald
Clayton	Hooley	Miller (CA)
Clement	Horn	Miller (FL)
Clyburn	Houghton	Minge
Condit	Hoyer	Mink
Costello	Hutchinson	Moakley
Coyne	Hyde	Mollohan
Cramer	Jackson (IL)	Moran (VA)
Cummings	Jackson-Lee	Morella
Danner	(TX)	Murtha
Davis (FL)	Jefferson	Nadler
Davis (IL)	John	Neal
Davis (VA)	Johnson (CT)	Oberstar
DeFazio	Johnson (WI)	Obey
DeGette	Johnson, E.B.	Olver
Delahunt	Kanjorski	Ortiz
DeLauro	Kaptur	Owens
Deutsch	Kennedy (MA)	Oxley
Diaz-Balart	Kennedy (RI)	Pallone
Dicks	Kennelly	Pascarell
Dingell	Kildee	Pastor
Dixon	Kilpatrick	Payne
Doggett	Kim	Pease
Dooley	Kind (WI)	Pelosi
Doyle	King (NY)	Peterson (MN)
Edwards	Klecza	Petri
Ehlers	Klink	Pickett
Engel	Kucinich	Pomeroy

NOT VOTING—10

Carson	Gilchrest	Schiff
Conyers	Gonzalez	Waxman
Dellums	Hunter	
Foglietta	Kolbe	

□ 1742

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1745

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 31, 1997, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device will be taken on the amendment on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOB SCHAFFER OF COLORADO

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado, [Mr. BOB SCHAFFER], on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by a voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 185, noes 238, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 386]

AYES—185

Aderholt	Bunning	Crane
Archer	Burr	Crapo
Armey	Calvert	Cubin
Bachus	Camp	Cunningham
Baker	Campbell	Deal
Ballenger	Canady	DeLay
Barr	Cannon	Diaz-Balart
Bartlett	Chabot	Doolittle
Barton	Chambliss	Dreier
Bass	Chenoweth	Duncan
Billbray	Christensen	Dunn
Bliley	Coble	Ehlers
Blunt	Coburn	Ehrlich
Boehner	Collins	Emerson
Bonilla	Combest	English
Bono	Cook	Ensign
Brady	Cooksey	Everett
Bryant	Cox	Ewing

NOES—238

Abercrombie	Dingell	Kennedy (MA)
Ackerman	Dixon	Kennedy (RI)
Allen	Doggett	Kennelly
Andrews	Dooley	Kildee
Baesler	Doyle	Kilpatrick
Baldacci	Edwards	Kind (WI)
Barcia	Engel	Klecza
Barrett (NE)	Eshoo	Klink
Barrett (WI)	Etheridge	Klug
Bateman	Evans	Kucinich
Becerra	Farr	LaFalce
Bentsen	Fattah	Lampson
Bereuter	Fawell	Lantos
Berman	Fazio	Lazio
Berry	Filner	Leach
Bilirakis	Flake	Levin
Bishop	Forbes	Lewis (CA)
Blagojevich	Ford	Lewis (GA)
Blumenauer	Fox	Lipinski
Boehlert	Frank (MA)	Livingston
Borski	Frelinghuysen	Lofgren
Boswell	Frost	Lowey
Boucher	Furse	Luther
Boyd	Gejdenson	Maloney (CT)
Brown (CA)	Gephardt	Maloney (NY)
Brown (FL)	Gilchrest	Manton
Brown (OH)	Gilman	Markey
Buyer	Gordon	Martinez
Callahan	Green	Mascara
Capps	Gutierrez	Matsui
Cardin	Hall (OH)	McCarthy (MO)
Castle	Hamilton	McCarthy (NY)
Coyne	Harman	McDade
Clay	Hastings (FL)	McDermott
Clayton	Hefner	McGovern
Clement	Hilliard	McHale
Clyburn	Hinchey	McHugh
Condit	Hinojosa	McIntyre
Conyers	Holden	McKinney
Costello	Hooley	McNulty
Coyne	Horn	Meehan
Cramer	Hoyer	Meek
Cummings	Jackson (IL)	Menendez
Danner	Jackson-Lee	Millender-
Davis (FL)	(TX)	McDonald
Davis (IL)	Jefferson	Miller (CA)
Davis (VA)	John	Miller (FL)
DeFazio	Johnson (CT)	Minge
DeGette	Johnson (WI)	Mink
Delahunt	Johnson, E.B.	Moakley
DeLauro	Kanjorski	Mollohan
Deutsch	Kaptur	Moran (VA)
Dickey	Kelly	Morella

Murtha	Regula	Stokes
Nadler	Reyes	Strickland
Neal	Rivers	Stupak
Northup	Rodriguez	Tanner
Oberstar	Roemer	Tauscher
Obey	Rothman	Thompson
Olver	Roybal-Allard	Thurman
Ortiz	Rush	Tierney
Owens	Sabo	Torres
Oxley	Sanchez	Towns
Packard	Sanders	Traficant
Pallone	Sandlin	Upton
Pascarell	Sawyer	Velazquez
Pastor	Schumer	Vento
Payne	Scott	Visclosky
Pelosi	Serrano	Walsh
Peterson (MN)	Sherman	Waters
Pickett	Shuster	Watt (NC)
Pomeroy	Sisisky	Weldon (PA)
Porter	Skaggs	Wexler
Poshard	Skelton	Weygand
Price (NC)	Slaughter	Wise
Pryce (OH)	Smith, Adam	Wolf
Quinn	Snyder	Woolsey
Rahall	Spratt	Wynn
Ramstad	Stabenow	Yates
Rangel	Stark	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—10

Bonior	Foglietta	Schiff
Burton	Gonzalez	Waxman
Carson	Hunter	
Dellums	Kolbe	

□ 1752

Mr. CAMP changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. CARSON. Mr. Chairman, I was unavoidably detained and unable to cast the following rollcall votes today. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: "Nay" on rollcall vote No. 380, "yea" on rollcall vote No. 381, "nay" on rollcall vote No. 382, "nay" on rollcall vote No. 384, "nay" on rollcall vote No. 385, and "nay" on rollcall vote No. 386.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SOLOMON was allowed to speak out of order for 1 minute.)

ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING AMENDMENTS TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 168, TO IMPLEMENT THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE BIPARTISAN HOUSE ETHICS REFORM TASK FORCE

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Rules will meet on Tuesday of next week to grant a rule which may limit the amendments to be offered to House Resolution 168, to implement the recommendations of the bipartisan House Ethics Reform Task Force. This task force, consisting of an equal number of Republicans and Democrats, has been working for several months to produce a product which is acceptable to Members on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Chairman, the last time there was an ethics reform package in 1989, it was also the result of a bipartisan task force. While there are many issues which are partisan around here, standards of official conduct is one area where things should be done on a bipartisan basis.

In light of this history, Members should be on notice that amendments with bipartisan cosponsorship will be viewed more favorably than partisan amendments. Any Member who desires to submit an amendment should submit 55 copies and a brief explanation of the amendment by 10 a.m. this coming

Tuesday, September 16, to the Committee on Rules in Room H-312 in the Capitol.

Members should also use the Office of Legislative Counsel to assure that their amendments are properly drafted and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain that their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

Mr. Chairman, I would advise Members to listen carefully to what I just said. It affects every Member of this House.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RODRIGUEZ

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RODRIGUEZ:
Page 66, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,500,000)".

Page 66, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,500,000)".

Page 73, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,500,000)".

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Chairman, let me indicate that the \$1.5 million will be coming off the evaluation going into direct service to the Comprehensive Regional Assistance Centers throughout this country.

Mr. Chairman, I thank all of my colleagues for the comments that I have received from all the Members that were willing to testify. I am going to ask my colleagues to hold on their testimony, since it is my understanding that we have an agreement on the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do want to thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] for his efforts and for agreeing to the \$1.5 million. My thanks also to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] for their efforts.

Mr. Chairman, I would indicate again that the \$1.5 million from evaluation goes directly for direct service to the Comprehensive Regional Assistance Centers. They are centers that basically provide the direct service that the teachers need in the classroom. They are the centers that provide the direct assistance that helps in terms of parental involvement. They are the centers that help also to enhance individuals and to enhance them to make sure that the teachers can deal with the new technology.

Mr. Chairman, one of the most important things is that we have a teacher that is well-qualified in the classroom. With that, Mr. Chairman, I ask for my colleagues' support.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Rodriguez amendment, just indicating that in one area, and I am sure it can be emulated in many areas across the Nation, in region 15, the Comprehensive Center for the Pacific will take care of areas in the most remote part of the jurisdiction of the United States, areas in the Pacific like American Samoa, Micronesia, the Mariana Islands, Guam, et cetera.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support for the amendment on the basis that Mr.

RODRIGUEZ has been able to put forward his amendment on a bipartisan basis.

□ 1800

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the majority has looked at the amendment of the gentleman from Texas, and we are very happy to accept it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, on this side of the aisle, we also accept the amendment.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this amendment offered by my good friend from Texas.

I support his amendment and the comprehensive regional assistance centers or CRAC's because they provide much-needed services to schools throughout this country. They are the most efficient source of information and services available under the Improving America's Schools Act, for local education agencies, tribes, and schools.

The CRAC's help districts revamp their curriculum to respond to the needs of disadvantaged, language minority, tribal, and migrant kids.

These centers work with State departments of education and with school districts in every State to assist them in important systemic reform and in providing technical assistance in critical areas such as technology in the classroom, special education, parental involvement, and the effective training of our countries' teachers.

The region 8 CRAC located in San Antonio supports the schools in my district of El Paso.

This CRAC and others provide a one-stop technical assistance shop for educators who receive title I funds.

The region 8 CRAC provides important services such as guidance to assist educators make informed decisions regarding the purchase of technology, professional development, curricula, and instructional materials.

The region 8 CRAC also provides easy access to accurate information about programs and practices that have proven successful in education children in other high-poverty areas and children from special populations.

Schools use the information provided by region 8 CRAC to help title I students learn.

I also know that other regional CRAC's have been successfully providing critical assistance to schools in other parts of the country.

For example, I know of one school district in Nebraska that has made great strides with the help of the region 7 CRAC located at the University of Oklahoma. The test scores of title I students in the Madison School District of Nebraska have greatly increased as a result of professional development and intervention by the region 7 CRAC.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ' amendment takes just a small percentage of the large increase in funding provided for the innovative education program for fiscal year 1998, but the amendment provides a large proportional increase for the CRAC's.

With the increase provided under this amendment, CRAC's can continue their quality service to school districts throughout this Nation.

The number of disadvantage, language minority, tribal, and migrant kids is increasing

every year, and as we enter the 20th century, the number of kids will continue to rise. We must be prepared to meet the needs of these students.

Vote for the Rodriguez amendment and help these centers continue the quality assistance that they have been providing for the past several years and continue to help this Nation's children.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. RODRIGUEZ for bringing this important amendment to the floor for a vote.

Comprehensive regional assistance centers are a vital resource for our educators, and they are the only source for federally funded comprehensive technical assistance.

They provide valuable resources for all of our children including children in high-poverty areas, children with disabilities, limited English-proficient children, and neglected or delinquent children.

I am fortunate to have one of these centers located in my district—the New York Technical Assistant Center [NYTAC] which is located at NYU's School of Education. I can see the positive influence that it has made.

It brings together five organizations in a partnership to provide technical assistance to the New York State Education Department.

It is one of 15 programs designed to assist schools, districts, and State education departments in implementing the Improving America's Schools Act. Children can only learn if those who teach them are endowed with the proper tools.

I was a teacher in the New York City public schools, and I know the necessity of having good and current resources at your fingertips.

If we do not give our educators the proper tools, we rob our children of their best chance at receiving a good education.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the Rodriguez amendment, for our Nation's schools, our children's future.

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Rodriguez amendment. We have heard a great deal about education standards throughout this debate. We all agree that it is time to improve the standards of education for all children in this country. The Rodriguez amendment advances this effort by increasing funding for the comprehensive regional technical assistance centers. These centers are designed to support students who most need educational assistance. The children of low-income families, homeless children, neglected and delinquent children, the children of migrant and immigrant families. These are the children that we have allowed to fall through the cracks of our educational system. These are the children from poor and underprivileged areas. These are the children in need, and deserving of our increased attention and assistance. If we, as a nation, are concerned about the standards of our public education system, if we are concerned that children with learning disabilities and limited skills in English are not advancing as they should be, we should support the network already in place to achieve these goals.

The comprehensive regional technical assistance centers not only support the students who most need it, but also assist in developing the management of schools and the learning environment required to meet the challenges of needed school reform. Keeping the schools safe and drug free, applying new technology for teaching and learning, contin-

ually evaluating the school systems, all of these activities are conducted by the comprehensive regional technical assistance centers. These 15 regional centers act as the coordinating mechanism to implement and initiate programs, integrating efforts of State and local agencies with the Department of Education.

For example, in my home district, the Southern California Comprehensive Assistance Center sponsors a new teacher induction training. This workshop assists new teachers in setting goals and assists school administrators in designing support interventions for their new teachers. Teachers and administrators get the opportunity to practice listening skills, improving their ability to communicate with students.

The center also sponsors a reading success network. This is a rigorous early intervention program designed to identify reading difficulties and promote students to appropriate grade levels. The center provides training, materials, and on-going assistance to administrators and parents through their web site. These are just a few of the programs and services that the Southern California Comprehensive Assistance Center has developed to advance the standards of education in region 12 and in our Nation.

This amendment is not about expanding big government or increasing Government regulations in schools. Rather, this amendment is about enhancing the network of support that our State and local educational agencies need to meet the special needs of students in rural and urban areas. If you stand for equity in education, if you believe that all children deserve a fair chance at the education they deserve, if you believe that we need to uphold high standards for education, I urge you to vote for the Rodriguez amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RODRIGUEZ].

The amendment was agreed to.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I would like to thank the distinguished subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], for providing sufficient funding for the program of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. I would like to ask him to engage in a discussion with me regarding SAMHSA.

The subcommittee has included language in the committee report urging the Center for Substance Abuse Treatment [CSAT] to assist corporations that are administering residential treatment for pregnant and postpartum women grants. These are programs that are experiencing difficulty complying with the match requirement.

I understand that the committee's intention with this language was to encourage CSAT to explore utilizing existing administrative authority to waive the match requirement for these grantees.

I also understand that CSAT has determined that they do not have enough existing administrative authority to waive the match requirement. So under these circumstances, would the gentleman from Illinois consider including

in the conference report on H.R. 2264 legislative language providing CSAT the authority to waive the match requirement for PPW grantees?

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Ms. WOOLSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California is correct. It was the committee's intent to encourage CSAT to utilize existing administrative authority if that authority were available to waive the match requirement for PPW grantees experiencing difficulty in meeting the match requirement.

In an attempt to address the gentleman's interests and the concerns of PPW grantees experiencing difficulty in meeting this match requirement, the committee will consider providing waiver authority if agreed to by our colleagues in the House Committee on Commerce when H.R. 2264 is considered in conference committee.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. His expression of support and his interest in this matter is very important to me.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. ENGEL

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. ENGEL:

Page 74, line 3, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$100,000)".

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I am proposing to the Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill would add \$100,000 to the Department of Education's program management account so that the Department can expand its Website to include enhanced information on private scholarships and financial aid.

I am proposing this amendment along with my New York colleague and good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mrs. MCCARTHY]. In 1992, the Higher Education Act was amended to require the Department to compile a database of all private and public student financial assistance programs. The department conducted a study in 1994 and found that the database would be beneficial because it would create a one-stop shopping area where students could access financial aid information through telephone, computer discs, and on-line services. However, funding for the program was ended in 1995 and has not been funded since that time.

This amendment would simply provide the Department with the necessary resources to expand its existing Website so that it would include the information required by the Higher Education Act. The funding would allow the Department to create on-line directories and establish links to post-secondary education institutions, financial aid offices, and government agencies that provide scholarships for students.

At a time when students are having more difficulty than ever in financing their education, we need to provide an objective, comprehensive outlet where available aid can easily be accessed. This problem is compounded by the fact that many students have been the victims of scams by fraudulent companies that pose as legitimate scholarship search services. Students often sign up and pay for services that claim to guarantee scholarships or financial aid. However, there are many scam artists out there who promise financial aid but never deliver on this promise leaving innocent students without the assistance they need.

Creating a centralized, reliable Website containing accurate information through the Department of Education would help students find the information they need to obtain funding for higher education.

The gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MCCARTHY] and I introduced legislation earlier this session that would require the Department to provide direct links from its Website to databases that contain reliable information on scholarships, fellowships, and other student financial aid. Helping the Department create a thorough database as required by law could be even more beneficial to students in their efforts to pay for an education.

Education is an investment in our future. Students already have a difficult time financing their studies as well as obtaining reliable information. One only has to look at the cost of higher education in this country. It has gone sky high each and every year and so our students are more and more dependent on financial aid.

Government ought to be facilitating this, making it easier for them to find out where they can get such financial aid, not making it harder. The amendment that I propose along with the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MCCARTHY] will do just that. We urge our colleagues to support this amendment so that we can help our young people further their academic pursuits.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I commend my friend from New York for his creativity and his frugality, and the majority is pleased to accept his amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, we also accept the amendment.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Engel-McCarthy amendment to the Labor-HHS bill. Our amendment would provide \$100,000 to the Department of Education to provide up-to-date information about financial aid and scholarships on its Website. I am a big believer in education. If we can make higher education accessible to more young people, then we will provide them with more opportunities and more hope for the future.

What has us all worried is the cost of a college education is rising every

year. I spend every Monday and Friday visiting the schools in my district. The students I talk to tell me they are depending upon scholarships and other kinds of aid to help pay for college. The World Wide Web has placed a lot of reliable information about scholarships at the fingertips of these students. But the Internet also is being used by scam artists and connen to fool students. These scam artists establish Websites with official sounding names. They use hard sell tactics like time limits, excessive hype to throw students off guard, and they promise students guaranteed scholarships if they pay up front fees.

Many young people have been lured into these Websites and after paying their money they have learned that there are no scholarships. This is wrong and it is time we did something about it. The Engel-McCarthy amendment would provide the Education Department with the money it needs to broaden its Internet site.

This will give more students and their parents access to legitimate information about scholarships and financial aid. It will warn students about Websites that are frauds. This small investment will move us toward our goal of making sure that a college education is in reach of more Americans. It will keep kids from wasting their money on fake scholarships. I urge my colleagues to support the Engel-McCarthy amendment.

I would like to thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] and certainly the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] for supporting us on this.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of title III be considered as read, printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The text of the remainder of title III is as follows:

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

For carrying out school improvement activities authorized by titles II, IV-A-1 and 2, V-A and B, VI, X and XIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act; and the Civil Rights Act of 1964; \$1,480,888,000, of which \$1,219,500,000 shall become available on July 1, 1998, and remain available through September 30, 1999: *Provided*, That of the amount appropriated, \$310,000,000 shall be for Eisenhower professional development State grants under title II-B of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, \$350,000,000 shall be for innovative education program strategies State grants under title VI-A of said Act and \$750,000 shall be for an evaluation of comprehensive regional assistance centers under title XIII of said Act.

LITERACY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For carrying out a literacy initiative, \$260,000,000, which shall become available on October 1, 1998 and shall remain available

through September 30, 1999 only if specifically authorized by subsequent legislation enacted by April 1, 1998: *Provided*, That, if the initiative is not authorized by such date, the funds shall be transferred to "Special Education" to be merged with that account and to be available for the same purposes for which that account is available: *Provided further*, That the transferred funds shall become available for obligation on July 1, 1999, and shall remain available through September 30, 2000 for academic year 1999-2000.

INDIAN EDUCATION

For expenses necessary to carry out, to the extent not otherwise provided, title IX, part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended, and section 215 of the Department of Education Organization Act, \$62,600,000.

BILINGUAL AND IMMIGRANT EDUCATION

For carrying out, to the extent not otherwise provided, bilingual, foreign language and immigrant education activities authorized by parts A and C and section 7203 of title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, without regard to section 7103(b), \$354,000,000: *Provided*, That State educational agencies may use all, or any part of, their part C allocation for competitive grants to local educational agencies: *Provided further*, That the Department of Education should only support instructional programs which ensure that students completely master English in a timely fashion (a period of three to five years) while meeting rigorous achievement standards in the academic content areas.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

For carrying out the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, \$4,348,647,000, of which \$4,117,186,000 shall become available for obligation on July 1, 1998, and shall remain available through September 30, 1999.

REHABILITATION SERVICES AND DISABILITY RESEARCH

For carrying out, to the extent not otherwise provided, the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, the Technology-Related Assistance for Individuals with Disabilities Act, and the Helen Keller National Center Act, as amended, \$2,589,176,000.

SPECIAL INSTITUTIONS FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND

For carrying out the Act of March 3, 1879, as amended (20 U.S.C. 101 et seq.), \$8,186,000.

NATIONAL TECHNICAL INSTITUTE FOR THE DEAF

For the National Technical Institute for the Deaf under titles I and II of the Education of the Deaf Act of 1986 (20 U.S.C. 4301 et seq.), \$43,841,000: *Provided*, That from the amount available, the Institute may at its discretion use funds for the endowment program as authorized under section 207.

GALLAUDET UNIVERSITY

For the Kendall Demonstration Elementary School, the Model Secondary School for the Deaf, and the partial support of Gallaudet University under titles I and II of the Education of the Deaf Act of 1986 (20 U.S.C. 4301 et seq.), \$80,682,000: *Provided*, That from the amount available, the University may at its discretion use funds for the endowment program as authorized under section 207.

VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION

For carrying out, to the extent not otherwise provided, the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act and the Adult Education Act, \$1,486,975,000, of which \$1,483,875,000 shall become available on July 1, 1998 and shall remain available through September 30, 1999; and of which \$4,491,000 from amounts available under the Adult Education Act shall be for the National Institute for Literacy under

section 384(c): *Provided*, That, of the amounts made available for title II of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act, \$13,497,000 shall be used by the Secretary for national programs under title IV, without regard to section 451: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may reserve up to \$4,998,000 under section 313(d) of the Adult Education Act for activities carried out under section 383 of that Act: *Provided further*, That no funds shall be awarded to a State Council under section 112(f) of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act, and no State shall be required to operate such a Council.

STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

For carrying out subparts 1 and 3 of part A, part C and part E of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, \$9,046,407,000, which shall remain available through September 30, 1999.

The maximum Pell Grant for which a student shall be eligible during award year 1998–1999 shall be \$3,000: *Provided*, That notwithstanding section 401(g) of the Act, if the Secretary determines, prior to publication of the payment schedule for such award year, that the amount included within this appropriation for Pell Grant awards in such award year, and any funds available from the fiscal year 1997 appropriation for Pell Grant awards, are insufficient to satisfy fully all such awards for which students are eligible, as calculated under section 401(b) of the Act, the amount paid for each such award shall be reduced by either a fixed or variable percentage, or by a fixed dollar amount, as determined in accordance with a schedule of reductions established by the Secretary for this purpose.

FEDERAL FAMILY EDUCATION LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For Federal administrative expenses to carry out guaranteed student loans authorized by title IV, part B, of the Higher Education Act, as amended, \$47,688,000.

HIGHER EDUCATION

For carrying out, to the extent not otherwise provided, parts A and B of title III, without regard to section 360(a)(1)(B)(ii), titles IV, V, VI, VII, and IX, and part A and subpart 1 of part B of title X of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, and Public Law 102-423; \$909,893,000, of which \$13,700,000 for interest subsidies under title VII of the Higher Education Act shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That funds available for part D of title IX of the Higher Education Act shall be available to fund noncompeting continuation awards for academic year 1998–1999 for fellowships awarded originally under part C of title IX of said Act, under the terms and conditions of part C: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding sections 419D, 419E, and 419H of the Higher Education Act, scholarships made under title IV, part A, subpart 6 shall be prorated to maintain the same number of new scholarships in fiscal year 1998 as in fiscal year 1997.

HOWARD UNIVERSITY

For partial support of Howard University (20 U.S.C. 121 et seq.), \$210,000,000: *Provided*, That from the amount available, the University may at its discretion use funds for the endowment program as authorized under the Howard University Endowment Act (Public Law 98–480).

COLLEGE HOUSING AND ACADEMIC FACILITIES LOANS PROGRAM

For Federal administrative expenses to carry out activities related to facility loans entered into under title VII, part C and section 702 of the Higher Education Act, as amended, \$698,000.

HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY CAPITAL FINANCING, PROGRAM ACCOUNT

The total amount of bonds insured pursuant to section 724 of title VII, part B of the Higher Education Act shall not exceed \$357,000,000, and the cost, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, of such bonds shall not exceed zero.

For administrative expenses to carry out the Historically Black College and University Capital Financing Program entered into pursuant to title VII, part B of the Higher Education Act, as amended, \$104,000.

EDUCATION RESEARCH, STATISTICS, AND IMPROVEMENT

For carrying out activities authorized by the Educational Research, Development, Dissemination, and Improvement Act of 1994, including part E; the National Education Statistics Act of 1994; section 2102, sections 3136 and 3141 and parts A, B, I, and K and section 10601 of title X, and part C of title XIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended, \$508,752,000: *Provided*, That \$50,000,000 of the amount provided for section 10101 of part A of title X of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act shall be for grants to local educational agencies to demonstrate effective approaches to whole school reform.

LIBRARIES

For carrying out subtitle B of the Museum and Library Services Act, \$142,000,000.

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

For carrying out, to the extent not otherwise provided, the Department of Education Organization Act, including rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia and hire of two passenger motor vehicles, \$329,479,000.

OFFICE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS

For expenses necessary for the Office for Civil Rights, as authorized by section 203 of the Department of Education Organization Act, \$55,449,000.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

For expenses necessary for the Office of the Inspector General, as authorized by section 212 of the Department of Education Organization Act, \$30,242,000.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. No funds appropriated in this Act may be used for the transportation of students or teachers (or for the purchase of equipment for such transportation) in order to overcome racial imbalance in any school or school system, or for the transportation of students or teachers (or for the purchase of equipment for such transportation) in order to carry out a plan of racial desegregation of any school or school system.

SEC. 302. None of the funds contained in this Act shall be used to require, directly or indirectly, the transportation of any student to a school other than the school which is nearest the student's home, except for a student requiring special education, to the school offering such special education, in order to comply with title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. For the purpose of this section an indirect requirement of transportation of students includes the transportation of students to carry out a plan involving the reorganization of the grade structure of schools, the pairing of schools, or the clustering of schools, or any combination of grade restructuring, pairing or clustering. The prohibition described in this section does not include the establishment of magnet schools.

SEC. 303. No funds appropriated under this Act may be used to prevent the implementation of programs of voluntary prayer and meditation in the public schools.

SEC. 304. None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be obligated or expended to carry out section 621(b) of Public Law 101–589.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 305. Not to exceed 1 percent of any discretionary funds (pursuant to the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act, as amended) which are appropriated for the current fiscal year for the Department of Education in this Act may be transferred between appropriations, but no such appropriation shall be increased by more than 3 percent by any such transfer: *Provided*, That the Appropriations Committees of both Houses of Congress are notified at least fifteen days in advance of any transfer.

SEC. 306. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, from funds appropriated under the Fund for the Improvement of Education, the Secretary of Education shall make an award, in an amount not to exceed \$1,000,000, to the National Academy of Sciences to evaluate and submit a preliminary report by June 30, 1998 and a final report by August 31, 1998 to the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives on the following items with respect to the Administration's proposed national tests in 4th grade reading and 8th grade math: (1) the technical quality of the work performed under the test development contract(s), linking activities, and contract(s) for providing the tests to States and school districts; (2) the adequacy of the administration of the field tests; (3) the validity and reliability of the data produced by the field tests; (4) the reasonableness and validity of the contractors' design for linking test results to student performance levels; and (5) the degree to which the tests can be expected to provide valid and useful information to the public: *Provided*, That in no event may the Department of Education proceed to administer any final version of the tests, until such time as a final National Academy of Sciences report is completed.

SEC. 307. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any institution of higher education which receives funds under title III of the Higher Education Act, except for grants made under section 326, may use up to twenty percent of its award under part A or part B of the Act for endowment building purposes authorized under section 331. Any institution seeking to use part A or part B funds for endowment building purposes shall indicate such intention in its application to the Secretary and shall abide by departmental regulations governing the endowment challenge grant program.

SEC. 308. AMENDMENTS TO ELIGIBLE LENDER DEFINITION.—Section 435(d)(1) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1085) is amended—

(1) by inserting before the semicolon at the end of subparagraph (A) the following: “; and in determining whether the making or holding of loans to students and parents under this part is the primary consumer credit function of the eligible lender, loans made or held as trustee or in a trust capacity for the benefit of a third party shall not be considered”;

(2) by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (I);

(3) in subparagraph (J), by striking the period and inserting “; and”;

(4) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(K) a wholly owned subsidiary of a publicly-held holding company which, as of the date of enactment of this subparagraph, through one or more subsidiaries (i) acts as a finance company, and (ii) participates in the program authorized by this part pursuant to subparagraph (C).”.

This title may be cited as the "Department of Education Appropriations Act, 1998".

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to this portion of the bill?

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE IV—RELATED AGENCIES

ARMED FORCES RETIREMENT HOME

For expenses necessary for the Armed Forces Retirement Home to operate and maintain the United States Soldiers' and Airmen's Home and the United States Naval Home, to be paid from funds available in the Armed Forces Retirement Home Trust Fund, \$71,777,000, of which \$16,325,000 shall remain available until expended for construction and renovation of the physical plants at the United States Soldiers' and Airmen's Home and the United States Naval Home.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. DICKEY] having assumed the chair, Mr. GOODLATTE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2264) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PERMISSION TO INCLUDE EXTRA-NEOUS MATERIAL ON H.R. 2264, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD extraneous material on H.R. 2264 relating to the issue of school reform.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

REPORT ON PAYMENTS MADE TO CUBA PURSUANT TO CUBAN DEMOCRACY ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 105-127)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

This report is submitted pursuant to 1705(e)(6) of the Cuban Democracy Act of 1992, 22 U.S.C. 6004(e)(6) (the "CDA"), as amended by section 102(g) of the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity (LIBERTAD) Act of 1996, Public Law 104-114 (March 12, 1996), 110 Stat. 785, 22 U.S.C. 6021-91 (the "LIBERTAD Act"), which requires that I report to the Congress on a semiannual basis de-

tailing payments to Cuba by any United States person as a result of the provision of telecommunications services authorized by this subsection.

The CDA, which provides that telecommunications services are permitted between the United States and Cuba, specifically authorizes the President to provide for payments to Cuba by license. The CDA states that licenses may be issued for full or partial settlement of telecommunications services with Cuba, but may not require any withdrawal from a blocked account. Following enactment of the CDA on October 23, 1992, a number of U.S. Telecommunications companies successfully negotiated agreements to provide telecommunications services between the United States and Cuba consistent with policy guidelines developed by the Department of State and the Federal Communications Commission.

Subsequent to enactment of the CDA, the Department of the Treasury's Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) amended the Cuban Assets Control Regulations, 31 C.F.R. Part 515 (the "CACR"), to provide for specific licensing on a case-by-case basis for certain transactions incident to the receipt or transmission of telecommunications between the United States and Cuba, 31 C.F.R. 515.542(c), including settlement of charges under traffic agreements.

The OFAC has issued eight licenses authorizing transactions incident to the receipt or transmission of telecommunications between the United States and Cuba since the enactment of the CDA. None of these licenses permits payments to the Government of Cuba from a blocked account. For the period January 1 through June 30, 1997, OFAC-licensed U.S. carriers reported payments to the Government of Cuba in settlement of charges under telecommunications traffic agreements as follows:

AT&T Corporation (formally, American Telephone and Telegraph Company)	\$13,997,179
AT&T de Puerto Rico	274,470
Global One (formerly, Sprint Incorporated)	4,857,205
IDB WorldCom Services, Inc. (formerly, IDB Communications, Inc.)	1,427,078
MCI International, Inc. (formerly, MCI Communications Corporation) ...	4,066,925
Telefonica Larga Distancia de Puerto Rico, Inc.	113,668
WilTel, Inc. (formerly, WilTel Underseas Cable, Inc.)	5,032,250
WorldCom, Inc. (formerly, LDDS Communications, Inc.)	1,378,502
Total	31,143,432

I shall continue to report semiannually on telecommunications payments to the Government of Cuba from United States persons.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 10, 1997.

□ 1815

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from California [Mr. FILNER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. FILNER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

VACATION OF SPECIAL ORDER AND GRANTING OF SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from California [Mr. FILNER] and to proceed at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DICKEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

TRIBUTE TO THE HELLENIC DANCERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAPPAS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest strengths of our great Nation is the diversity of our people, cultural, religions, and heritage. Every American has a story to tell of where their family is from. Whether you can trace your roots back to a particular native American tribe or to another country, maybe across the sea, many of us seek out ways to preserve what has been passed down to us so that we may pass it along to the next generation.

This year marks the 25th anniversary of the Hellenic Dancers of New Jersey, a group that has dedicated themselves to perpetuating Greek culture through dance. For those of us, including myself, that are of Greek ancestry, the service this group provides is invaluable. Aside from performing the dances of Greece, the Hellenic Dancers are committed to researching, documenting and educating others in the Greek heritage.

The dancers are a group of Greek descendants that travel each week without compensation from every part of central and northern New Jersey to perform and share the Greek culture. They have also ventured outside of New Jersey, from coast to coast in this Nation, with their music and dance recognizing the spirit of Greeks that have gone before, the Greeks that have brought so much to this country, and those Greek-Americans living here today.

Over the past 25 years, the group has grown tremendously. What began with a few members now numbers well into the hundreds of selfless individuals who share the songs, dances, and traditions that have been passed along to them.

Greece has survived through a great deal of turmoil over the years and has reached maturity because its people, proud, freedom-loving, God-fearing and peaceful, have nourished and upheld the ideals on which their nation was founded. It is this heritage that we, the